



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|-----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/771,186 | 01/29/2001 | Lawrence Bernard Kool | RD-28,011 | 7166 |
| 23413 | 7590 | 08/11/2004 | EXAMINER | |
| CANTOR COLBURN, LLP 55 GRIFFIN ROAD SOUTH BLOOMFIELD, CT 06002 | | | MARKOFF, ALEXANDER | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 1746 | |

DATE MAILED: 08/11/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|---|---------------------------------|----|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | AS |
| | 09/771,186 Examiner Alexander Markoff | KOOL ET AL. Art Unit 1746 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 May 2004.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-4, 6, 9-28 and 30-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) 24-27, 28, 30-33 is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-4, 6 and 17-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 9-16 and 22 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____. |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. |

DETAILED ACTION***Claim Objections***

1. Claims 9-16 and 22 objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. Claim 1 requires contacting the substrate with an aqueous composition consisting essentially of the recited components. Claim 9 requires the composition “further consisting essentially of at least one additional acid. This is not proper because Claim 9 broadens the limitations of claim 1. Claim 22 requires the composition to form a portion of a bath and requires the bath to comprise additives. This contradicts to the language of claim 1 and broadens the scope of Claim 1.

The claims are not further treated on the merits.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 1-4, 6, and 17-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the

Art Unit: 1746

inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The applicants amended the claims to limit the substrate to be a turbine component comprising nickel, chromium, (iron), cobalt or at least of these metals or a polymer. This is not supported by the original disclosure.

The original disclosure fails to support the limitation of a turbine component made of polymer or at least one of the recited metals. The original disclosure recites the turbine components made only from specific alloys.

The original disclosure fails to support removing of oxidized polymer. In contrast it stays that oxides not formed on polymers. See page 7, lines 7-10 of the specification.

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 1-4, 6, and 17-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The claims are indefinite because it is not clear what is referenced as an oxidized product of a polymer. It is again noted that the specification stays that oxides not formed on polymers. See page 7, lines 7-10 of the specification.

Response to Amendment

6. The amendment filed 5/25/04 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132 because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132 states that no

Art Unit: 1746

amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows:

The applicants amended the claims to limit the substrate to be a turbine component comprising nickel, chromium, (iron), cobalt or at least of these metals or a polymer. This is not supported by the original disclosure.

The original disclosure fails to support the limitation of a turbine component made of polymer or at least one of the recited metals. The original disclosure recites the turbine components made only from specific alloys.

The original disclosure fails to support removing of oxidized polymer. In contrast it stays that oxides not formed on polymers. See page 7, lines 7-10 of the specification.

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 24-27, 28, and 30-33 are allowed. The reasons for indicating the claims allowable were previously provided. The amendment of Claim 27 made to specify that the same composition is used in steps (i) and (ii) further limits the scope of the previously allowed claim. The deletion of "then" from claim 27 does not change the scope of the claim because it is inherent that the new coating is applied to replace the old one is applied after the old one has been removed.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-4, 6, and 17-23 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alexander Markoff whose telephone number is 571-272-1304. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Barr can be reached on 571-272-1414. The fax

Art Unit: 1746

phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Alexander Markoff
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1746

am

**ALEXANDER MARKOFF
PRIMARY EXAMINER**